

II. REMARKS

The examiner objected to claims 32-33, and 36-44 because of informalities. Claims 32-33 and 36-44 have been amended to remove the informalities.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-7, 14-17, 20-21, 28-29, 32-33, 36-37, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christodoulou et al. (2002/0159092, hereinafter “Christodoulou”) in view of Rourke et al. (2004/0190042, “Rourke”).

Claims 1, 15 and 29

Amended claims 1, 15 and 29 each recite “analyzing a metadata in a plurality of document pages to determine a required printer type; separating each of the plurality of document pages into a plurality of print jobs based on the required printer type for each document page; placing each of the plurality of document pages into an appropriate holding queue for an appropriate printer; selecting the appropriate printer for each of the plurality of print jobs; and printing the plurality of print jobs on a plurality of appropriate printers; wherein when the required printer type is a specific printer, compiling all pages from the plurality of print jobs requiring the specific printer into a single print job for the specific printer.” The examiner recites Christodoulou, [0036], line 9-16 and Rourke 2:19-24 and 5:15-21 in regard to the limitations previously presented. Applicant submits that Christodoulou and Rourke are silent as to a required printer being a specific printer, and more specifically, “when the required printer type is a specific printer, compiling all pages from the plurality of print jobs requiring the specific printer into a single print job for the specific printer.” Support for the amendment to claims 1, 15, and 29 may be found on page 10, lines 6-7.

Claims 14, 28 and 44

Amended claims 14, 28, and 44 recited “wherein the appropriate printer is determined using a print farm profile; and wherein the print farm profile includes data regarding a number, a size, and a type for each of a plurality of print jobs in a print queue for the appropriate printer, and a printer speed and an amount of paper in a printer bin for the appropriate printer”. The examiner previously cited Christodoulou, paragraph [0034] as disclosing the “print farm profile” because it contained “data for a printer.” But Christodoulou discloses a log or store of job tickets. Christodoulou does not disclose data regarding a number of jobs in a print queue because a store or log of job tickets is not the same as a print queue. Moreover, Christodoulou does not disclose providing printer speed and the amount of paper in a printer bin. For example, Christodoulou discloses data on the amount of paper required for a job, but this is not the same as data on the amount of paper in a specific printer bin. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification, page 6, lines 1-3.

Claims 2-13, 15-27, and 32-43

The remaining claims 2-13, 15-27, and 32-43 depend from allowable claims 1, 15, and 29, and therefore are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance. If the examiner has any questions, applicant request the examiner call applicant's attorney at 214-2321-4703 (direct).

Respectfully submitted,



Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2800
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-231-4660
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com